

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending. Of these, claims 1, 11 and 18 are written in independent format.

**Interview on January 24, 2007**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her cooperation, particularly in the form of the interview conducted on January 24, 2007 with one of Applicant's representatives, namely Thomas S. Auchterlonie. During the interview, Applicant's understanding of the applied combination of art was discussed. Also, the respective distinctions of claims 1 and 18 (noted below) were discussed.

**§103 Rejection**

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,888 to Stewart ("the Stewart '888 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,649,000 to Lee et al. ("the Lee '000 patent"). This rejection is traversed.

The Stewart '888 patent teaches that hopping is initiated by mobile unit step 501, in col. 10, lines 10-15. Similarly, the Lee '000 patent teaches that the mobile unit initiates a handoff; see col. 7, lines 54-58. There, the Lee '000 patent teaches that when a pilot signal receiver 60 within a mobile unit determines that all intensity values are lower than a threshold value, then a controller 64 within the mobile unit sends a different frequency handoff request to a cellular control system 10.

A distinction over each of the Stewart '888 and Lee '000 patents of method claim 1 is initiating via a master device, unregistration at a controller. Again, the Stewart '888 and Lee '000 patents teach mobile-initiated hopping/handover, which is different than master-device-initiated unregistration.

It appears that the Examiner has attempted to rebut Applicant's asserted distinction of claim 1 by citing (see page 2 of the Office Action) to column 1, lines 10-24 of the Stewart '888 patent. For the reader's convenience, column 1, lines 8-23 are reprinted as follows (underlined emphasis added):

This invention is for use with wireless local area networks (LANs). Such networks include a plurality of mobile **[End of line 9; beginning of line 10]** devices such as portable computers or other information processing devices, which communicate in a wireless fashion. The mobile devices normally communicate with a wired infrastructure via access points. The mobile devices normally communicate with a wired infrastructure via access points. Each access point represents a base station for a microcell which operates in accordance with a frequency hopping scheme in a frequency band, for example the frequency band from 2.4 to 2.4835 GHz. The mobile devices must establish communication links with new access points when they move out of range of old access points. Also, for proper load handling, it may be preferable to switch a mobile device to another access point to more uniformly distribute network capacity, even when the mobile device is still within range of its previous access point.

## 2. Description of the Related Art

In the above-quoted passage, the Stewart '888 patent teaches that mobile devices "must" establish communication links with new access points when they move out of range of old access points. How can this be considered master-device-initiated unregistration? Regarding making a switch to another access point, the above-quoted passage is silent as to what component of the

system initiates the switch. Nothing about the above-quoted passage teaches that anything is master-device-initiated. Thus, Applicant continues to assert as a distinction the feature of claim 1 explained above.

A distinction over the Stewart '888 and Lee '000 patents of independent claim 18 (for example) is monitoring a strength at the master device for a signal transmitted by the dependent. As mobile-initiated hopping/handover technologies, the Stewart '888 and Lee '000 patents contemplate some sort of signal strength monitoring taking place at the mobile unit, not at a master device.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has been unable to determine where the Examiner's assertedly new obviousness rationale addresses the above-noted distinction of claim 18. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of claim 18, it is submitted that the Examiner must explain why she is not persuaded that the distinction of claim 18 asserted above actually distinguishes over the combination of the Stewart '888 patent and the Lee '000 patent.

Claims 2-10 and 19 depend at least indirectly from claims 1 and 18, and at least similarly distinguish over the applied art, respectively.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection is improper and withdrawal is requested.

#### **Allowed Claims 11-17**

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claims 11-17.

**CONCLUSION**

The issues raised in the Office Action are considered to be resolved. Accordingly, Applicant again requests a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any underpayment or non-payment of any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, or credit any overpayment of such fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-0750, including, in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:



Thomas S. Auchterlonie, Reg. No. 37,275  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, VA 20195  
(703) 668-8000

TSA/cm